Ham-Policy Digest   Mon, 12 Apr 93   Volume 93 : Issue   93

Today's Topics:
        fido node regurgitating articles in rec.radio.amateur.*
          rec.radio.amateur reorg/RFD discussion summary 4/11

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Sat, 10 Apr 1993 17:10:23 GMT
From: valinor.mythical.com!n5ial!jim@uunet.uu.net
Subject: fido node regurgitating articles in rec.radio.amateur.*
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

please excuse the cross-posting, but I'm seeing this in all 3 r.r.a groups,
so in this case, it seems appropriate....my apologies if this isn't a valid
assumption (but then, the post actually only gets sent once either way, so
it's not as if it generates any extra net.traffic or anything).

it would seem that once again, there is a fido node somewhere that seems to
think that the rest of the world wants to see duplicate copies of every
single post. anyone know how to handle this?

for example, in rec.radio.amateur.policy (when I finally decided I wasn't
imagining things), I saw a post from greg@core.rose.hp.com (Greg Dolkas).
a few articles later, guess what....that exact same post is repeated.
however, this time the article claims to be from
Greg.Dolkas@f716.n109.z1.his.com (Greg Dolkas).

the last time I saw this was about a week ago in comp.os.linux, and it

was a fido node that wasn't configured right, or something like that.
the symptoms were identical, and just as could quickly become the case
here, it was no doubt costing a lot of $$$ for some folks (a high-volume
newsgroup is bad enough...but when someone decides to double that volume
with duplicate postings, that's *REALLY* bad).

anyone know how to proceed in getting these duplicates stopped?
    --jim

--
#include <std_disclaimer.h>   73 DE N5IAL (/4)

INTERNET: jim@n5ial.mythical.com | j.graham@ieee.org   ICBM: 30.23N 86.32W
AMATEUR RADIO: n5ial@w4zbb (Ft. Walton Beach, FL)   AMTOR SELCAL: NIAL

E-mail me for information about KAMterm (host mode for Kantronics TNCs).

Date: 11 Apr 93 12:21:36 GMT
From: rtech!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: rec.radio.amateur reorg/RFD discussion summary 4/11
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

This article contains 5 subtopics:
    Current Status of the Discussion
    How to Participate in the Discussion
    Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)
    Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II)
    Notes from the discussion so far

Current Status of the Discussion

The RFD (Request for Discussion) for the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur
was posted on March 26 to news.announce.newgroups, news.groups, and all the
subgroups of rec.radio.amateur. A summary of the proposed newsgroups can be
found later in this article.

We have passed the half-way point in the 30-day discussion period. Current
tallies of opinions posted to news.groups are as follows:
    in favor: 25 people 93 articles
    opposed: 14 people 30 articles
    undecided or unclear: 10 people 18 articles
(the "unclear" category only includes replies that were off the subject)

These numbers may seem small by UseNet standards but it has actually been one

of the larger of many ongoing discussions on news.groups. Support has been
running around the 2-to-1 in favor area since the discussion started. Due
to the support expressed, we expect that it will be possible to issue a CFV
(Call for Votes) some time after the end of the discussion period, which will
conclude on April 26, 1993.

How to Participate in the Discussion

If you have not yet expressed an opinion on the proposed split, you can make
it easy on yourself by just replying to this article onto news.groups (the
Followup-To line already specifies that for you) and say
     I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur
or
     I do not support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur

YOUR REPLY MUST BE POSTED TO NEWS.GROUPS IN ORDER TO BE AN OFFICIAL PART OF
THE NEWSGROUP CREATION PROCESS. You may cross-post to rec.radio.amateur.misc
if you prefer to.

It would be even more helpful, if you support the split of r.r.a.misc, to
indicate which option from the RFD that you prefer. It's OK to say you like
both. They are summarized below. You can still make things pretty easy for
yourself by only posting
     I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur (Option I)
or
     I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur (Option II)
or
     I support the reorganization of rec.radio.amateur (either option)

Here's a question to ask yourself as you consider these proposals:
  Which proposal would make you more likely to vote for all the newsgroups
  when voting time arrives? (Separate concurrent votes will be held for
  each newsgroup in accordance with the newsgroup creation guidelines.)

Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option I)

(all groups unmoderated)

Newsgroup name	description
rec.radio.amateur.misc	all Ham radio topics not covered below i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.policy	regulations & policy issues [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc	packet radio & other digital modes

```
                                            [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip            TCP/IP via packet radio
rec.radio.amateur.operating                 Operating procedures and questions: DX,
                                            CW, contests, propagation, repeaters
rec.radio.amateur.products                  manufactured equipment, modifications
rec.radio.amateur.instruction               Ham radio instruction & examination
rec.radio.amateur.construction              homebrewing & experimentation
rec.radio.amateur.space                     amateur radio in space: satellites,
                                            earth-moon-earth (EME), shuttle, MIR
rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services            emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS


Summary of RFD proposed newsgroups (Option II - "the .tech option")
-------------------------------------------------------------------
(all groups unmoderated)
Newsgroup name                              description
--------------                              -----------------------------
rec.radio.amateur.misc                      all Ham radio topics not covered below
                                            i.e. video, stories, humor, new topics
                                            [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.policy                    regulations & policy issues
                                            [no modification to existing newsgroup]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc              packet radio & other digital modes
                                            [includes old rec.radio.amateur.packet]
rec.radio.amateur.digital.tcp-ip            TCP/IP via packet radio
rec.radio.amateur.operating                 Operating procedures and questions: DX,
                                            CW, contests, propagation, repeaters
rec.radio.amateur.emerg-services            emergency services: RACES, ARES, NTS
rec.radio.amateur.tech                      Technical discussions about Ham Radio:
                                            construction, theory, examinations,
                    video


Notes from the discussion so far
--------------------------------


The following notes may help you determine if any suggestions you are
considering have already been discussed.  Your opinion is important so be
sure to show your support or opposition and make any suggestions you believe
would help make this a better, more successful proposal.

* There has been strong agreement that r.r.a.misc has too much traffic.
* One of the main points made by those opposing the split has been a concern
  that there may be a lot of cross-posting of articles across the proposed
  newsgroups.  r.r.a.policy was commonly used as an example.
* Rebuttal to the cross-posting argument pointed out that even in r.r.a.policy
  there is currently very little cross-posting.  With numbers to show this was
  a misconception, one person withdrew opposition and began supporting the
```

split.
* A point made by proponents of the split was that r.r.a.policy is not a good
  comparison. All the proposed newsgroups were modeled after r.r.a.packet,
  which was made for a subject that many Hams are interested in. r.r.a.policy
  was just a place to throw away an unwanted subject. Still others said that
  r.r.a.policy has plenty of ongoing policy-related discussion and has also
  worked pretty well.
* On the subject of cross-posting, there has been some discussion about a
  netiquette guide like that found on rec.aviation for the past several years.
  The idea may be considered regardless of the result of the vote.
* Some concern was expressed by both supporters and opposers about the
  Info-Hams mail list. A common concern was that the mail lists will need to
  match the newsgroups in order for this to work. Comments from Brian Kantor
  indicated a wait-and-see position. He did not rule out making new mail lists
  if the newsgroups pass but he is understandably not enthusiastic since he
  has plenty of other work to do.
* Two people questioned why the proposal includes making a subhierarchy for
  r.r.a.digital.misc and r.r.a.digital.tcp-ip. It was pointed out that these
  were requested by users of r.r.a.packet due to the explosion of new digital
  modes. There has been no opposition from the r.r.a.packet community.
* Most people supporting the split have not indicated which option (I or II)
  they support. It was noted that it's been difficult to determine which will
  be the most-likely-to-succeed choice to put on the CFV.
* Those who prefer Option I seem to do so because the newsgroup names are
  clearer and more focused. It was said that r.r.a.tech is too general to
  differentiate itself significantly from r.r.a.misc. So the advantage is
  that Option I avoids some confusion. (Option I adds 7 newsgroups)
* Those who prefer Option II (r.r.a.tech) seem to do so because it has fewer
  newsgroups than Option I while still offering an area for technical
  discussion away from r.r.a.misc. So the advantage is that Option II is not
  as large an increase in newsgroups. (Option II adds 5 newsgroups)
* A preference was stated to change r.r.a.products to r.r.a.equipment.
  Rebuttals said that would be confusing next to r.r.a.construction. The
  suggestion did not have enough support to be added to the proposal.
* A preference was stated to change r.r.a.construction to r.r.a.homebrewing.
  Rebuttals said that the name would not be clear enough to outsiders or
  newcomers. The suggestion did not have enough support to be added to the
  proposal.
* A preference was stated to change r.r.a.operating to r.r.a.dx. Rebuttals
  said this would eliminate coverage for many other aspects of operating
  a radio. (Notably, UHF/VHF repeaters.) Also, this was considered on the
  rra-reorg mail list prior to the RFD, where DX and repeaters were combined
  to make r.r.a.operating. Another suggestion was to add r.r.a.dx alongside
  r.r.a.operating. The suggestion does not appear to have enough support but
  some discussion may continue.
* A preference was stated to add an r.r.a.bulletins newsgroup. No replies
  were made to a subsequent poll on the subject so the suggestion is assumed
  to have insufficient support. One problem was noted that it mostly overlaps

rec.radio.info which serves all of rec.radio, including rec.radio.amateur.*.
* A couple articles suggested adding an r.r.a.flame newsgroup. Most
  participants seem to have assumed that was said tongue-in-cheek. It has not
  been taken seriously.
* r.r.a.space appears to have significant support. It will probably be on the
  CFV (call for votes) whether Option I or II is selected as the final model.
  It was noted that this will mean that Option II will add 6 newsgroups
  instead of 5. (r.r.a.space was previously only on Option I.)
* A suggestion was made to add an RDF (radio direction finding) newsgroup to
  the proposal. The original suggestion was to call it r.r.a.jamming. Another
  article suggested a clearer name of r.r.a.rdf. An opposing opinion said
  there is not enough traffic to make a separate newsgroup for this topic.
  This subject is not done being discussed but does not yet have enough support
  in the discussion to add it to the proposal.
--
Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL   Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com   Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #93
****